

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/059,727	01/29/2002	Luan Tran	MCT.0004C1US	MCT.0004C1US 7665	
7	10/01/2003		EXAMINER		
Timothy N. Trop			FENTY, JESSE A		
TROP, PRUNER, HU & MILES Suite 100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
8554 Katy Freeway			2815		
Houston, TX	77024		DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				,2m
	Application No.	Applie	cant(s)	•
Advisory Action	10/059,727	TRAN	ET AL.	
navioury nation	Examiner \(\int \)	Art U	nit	
	Jesse A. Fenty	2815		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cov r she	et with the corresp	ondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment ((1) a timely filed ame	of this application. ndment which plac	A proper replication A proper	ly to a ation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The distance been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extermining the period of the shortened patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	than SIX MONTHS from the S FILED WITHIN TWO MO late on which the petition un insion and the corresponding ed statutory period for reply	emailing date of the fina NTHS OF THE FINAL der 37 CFR 1.136(a) ar g amount of the fee. Th priginally set in the final	I rejection. REJECTION. Se nd the appropriate e appropriate exte Office action; or ()	extension fee extension fee ension fee under 2) as set forth in
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF)				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:			
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furtly	her consideration and	l/or search (see No	OTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note		•	•	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for ap	peal by materially	reducing or si	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding	number of finally	rejected claim	ns.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would	· · · ——	mitted in a separat	e, timely filed	amendment
canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		•		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request f application in condition for allowance because: S			l but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not direct	ed SOLELY to issu	ues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v				and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .				
Claim(s) objected to: 9.				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 10-25</u> .			`	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.			/	
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on i	is a) ☐ approved or	b) disapproved	by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem 10. Other:	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Pa	aper No(s).		
TO. Culer.		SUPERVISORY	DIE LEE PATENT EXAN GY CENTER 28	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited references (Aoki/Chu) cannot be used because the references "teach away" from the instant application. However, MPEP section 2145(X)(D)(1) states that, "[A] known or obvious composition does not become patentable simply because it has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product for the same use." Aoki chooses an open bit line configuration rather than folded, to achieve the desired size dimension, based on what was then known in the art. In the semiconductor technology field, where device dimensions continue to get smaller and smaller, the size dimension in this application cannot be considered the sole determining factor for patentability; as additional references have been cited (e.g. Keeth et al. (U.S. 2003/0071295) that demonstrate the claimed dimension was known to the prior art at the time of filing.